

RESEARCH IN COMPARATIVE POLITICS: PLANS OF A NEW COUNCIL COMMITTEE

by Gabriel A. Almond

READERS of *Items* are aware of the Council's interest in furthering research in comparative politics. An inter-university summer research seminar on the scope and methods of research in this field was held in the summer of 1952, under the chairmanship of Roy C. Macridis of Northwestern University; and a summary report on the deliberations of the seminar appeared in the December 1952 issue of *Items*.¹ The plans for this seminar were discussed with the Council's Committee on Political Behavior.² In developing its own plans for the study of political behavior and processes in the United States, it seemed to this committee that insight into the special characteristics of American political institutions might be gained by studying political processes in countries in other parts of the world, particularly in non-Western areas. It was thought that studies in those areas would show significant contrasts which would call attention to aspects of politics in the United States and in the Western world generally that are often taken for granted. It seemed, too, that we should be able to learn something of the essential nature of politics and of the conditions that give rise to its specific forms by studying areas in which formal and explicit political processes are only now taking shape, and in which societies are moving from traditional and tribal forms of organization into the stage at which government has a separate and specialized structure. These considerations led the Com-

mittee on Political Behavior to sponsor a conference on the study of comparative politics.

THE PRINCETON CONFERENCE

This conference was held at Princeton on December 11-12, 1953. The participants included members of the committee and a number of scholars currently working in this field.³ At the invitation of the committee, Lucian W. Pye of Princeton University had prepared a memorandum dealing with problems of theory and method in the study of comparative politics in non-Western areas for discussion at the conference. David E. Apter and Lloyd A. Fallers of Princeton commented on their own research in Africa in terms of the theoretical categories suggested in the memorandum; and on the second day of the conference Guy J. Pauker of Harvard, Roland Young of Northwestern, and George McT. Kahin of Cornell led a discussion of some of the main points advanced in the memorandum. Another session of the conference discussed a paper prepared by William Ebenstein of Princeton offering specific suggestions for the improvement of research in comparative government.

The importance of comparative politics as a field of study was strongly supported. In the course of the discussions at least three major points of view were

¹ A full report on the seminar, "Research in Comparative Politics," by Roy Macridis and Richard Cox, was published in the *American Political Science Review*, September 1953, pp. 641-657.

² The members of this committee are David B. Truman (chairman), Conrad M. Arensberg, Angus Campbell, Alfred de Grazia, Oliver Garceau, V. O. Key, Avery Leiserson, and M. Brewster Smith.

³ In addition to the committee the attendants were Gabriel A. Almond, David E. Apter, Ralph J. D. Braibanti, William Ebenstein, Lloyd A. Fallers, G. Lowell Field, Pendleton Herring, George McT. Kahin, Joseph G. La Palombara, Marion J. Levy, Jr., Roy C. Macridis, William W. Marvel, Guy J. Pauker, Lucian W. Pye, Kenneth W. Thompson, Bryce Wood, and Roland Young.

advanced. According to one view, research in this field can best be done on the basis of common categories in order to make systematic cross-cultural comparisons possible. This was the position of the Pye memorandum which proposed a set of categories for the comparative analysis of political systems. Others expressed the view that research on comparative politics cannot proceed effectively unless it is based on a conceptual scheme that embraces the processes and institutions of society as a whole. A third position emphasized the problem approach, in which the criterion would be that of significance or relevance to pressing current issues. As an illustration it was pointed out that countries in various parts of the world are confronted with the problem of how best to devolve authority in situations in which there is a poverty of leadership and in which formal political institutions have been newly introduced and are as yet untested. Such a situation would suggest a series of comparative studies of the relative effectiveness of various ways of approaching the problems involved.

These were the more sharply differentiated points of view that emerged at the conference. Other opinions were expressed and discussed and opened up possibilities for further elaboration.

It had not been expected that the conference would produce an agreement concerning theory and methods of research in comparative politics. Its main purpose was to determine whether there is sufficient interest and creative activity in this field to justify the appointment of a research planning committee by the Council, and the existence of such interest was amply demonstrated. At the same time it was clearly understood that such a committee should not seek to be considered *the* committee on research in its field but rather *a* committee which would have as its focus the nonformal institutions and processes of politics, and which would consist of persons familiar not only with Western European political institutions but with the problems of political development in non-Western areas.

FORMATION OF THE COMMITTEE

As a direct result of the conference, the Council's Committee on Problems and Policy in January 1954 appointed a Committee on Comparative Politics, consisting of Taylor Cole of Duke University, George McT. Kahin of Cornell, Roy C. Macridis of Northwestern, Guy J. Pauker of Harvard, Lucian W. Pye of Princeton, and Gabriel A. Almond of Princeton (chairman). The first meeting of this group, held on February 19, was devoted mainly to consideration of how its interest should be distributed among the following possible emphases: improvement of the theoretical

framework for study of comparative politics; development of specific research approaches; problems of training for research in the field.

The specific question whether the committee should limit its interests to areas in which there is an explicit formal process and exclude the primitive tribal type of organization was raised. It was decided that while the members of the committee are not likely to be engaged in anthropological studies of political behavior in tribal systems, the committee should nevertheless be interested in those parts of the world in which such organizations are units in larger political systems. It was recognized that one of the most interesting problems in the study of politics today is the role played by tribal units in the political process in colonial and backward areas.

THE COMMITTEE'S APPROACH TO THEORY

Students of the political process have much to learn from the social theorists and from the philosophers of science and scientific method. The committee did not question the possible usefulness of theoretical insights but considered ways in which their usefulness could be tested. It was suggested that a "forced draft" approach to theory construction often produces quite harmful results. When used by inexperienced persons "systematic theory" often inhibits imagination and hinders effective assimilation of the data to which the scholar is exposed or, worse, creates an illusion of intellectual mastery which may be dispelled only during a long and wasteful process. The committee plans at a later time to give a more thorough consideration to the question of the applicability of general theoretical systems to the study of comparative politics.

One proposal seriously entertained was the desirability of inviting individuals identified with theoretical work in the social sciences and in philosophy to participate in the committee's work as consultants. The basic question that might be put to various theorists would be: By means of what categories can one make systematic and significant comparisons between political processes?

DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH STRATEGY

The committee concluded that it could profitably investigate a number of gaps in knowledge concerning comparative politics. Several significant areas toward which research could be usefully directed were suggested. It was argued that scholars might appropriately take advantage of several "laboratory" situations which have emerged particularly in non-Western areas. Thus

a series of studies concerning the impact of technical assistance activities on the politics of various countries might be made, and also a series of studies focused on patterns of devolution of authority from colonial to native rule.

A second approach proposed by the committee emphasized two major opportunities to improve the state of knowledge about the political process on a comparative basis. The first of these concerns the non-formal aspects of Western European politics. For Western European countries there are few studies of the activities of trade unions, churches, business groups, the media of communication, and other institutions that influence policy making. Similarly our knowledge about political parties in Western Europe is inadequate. The emphasis in the United States in the last twenty years on studies of parties, pressure groups, electoral processes, and public opinion have not had significant counterparts in Western Europe. As a consequence our knowledge of Western European politics and our insight into the special features of our own politics have lagged in these respects.

The subject of the Princeton conference—the study of the political process in non-Western areas—was identified as a second major area in which greater research effort is needed. The whole field of comparative politics will gain from research on these areas that departs from the standard descriptions of political institutions. There was general agreement in the committee on the importance of developing plans for research in both these fields in such a way that maximum contributions to theory may be made.

The committee then considered how in the short run it might proceed toward the realization of its objectives both with regard to theory and research strategy. It was proposed that the committee select a single concrete institution that each member could examine in the particular political and cultural setting with which he has had prior experience. Several possible institutions were discussed. It was finally decided that analysis of the role of organized labor in the political process might be one of the best choices. The area competence of the committee membership would make it possible to examine the role of organized labor in such strikingly different contexts as France, Germany, Italy, Indonesia, Mexico, and Malaya.

PLANS FOR A SECOND MEETING

As a first assignment the committee agreed that each member would write a brief memorandum based on his knowledge of the ways in which organized labor impinges on the political process in a particular area,

for circulation in advance of the second meeting of the committee to be held on May 8. Each memorandum will treat the relationship of trade unions to the social and ethnic structure of the population, their actions in relation to political parties, the electoral process, and administrative and legislative functions. In other words, each committee member is to prepare a brief analysis of the "political role" of trade unions. These memoranda are conceived as modest efforts to explore problems of theory on the one hand and to appraise a specific research gap on the other. It is hoped that the memoranda may suggest hypotheses as to the variety of roles that organized labor plays in the political process. This in turn may lead to a fruitful discussion of possible categories of factors for the comparative analysis of other political processes. If the discussion of labor's role in the political process yields stimulating suggestions for research it may be followed by the selection of another unit of comparison, such as the political role of religious organizations in different cultures. This, too, might have both theoretical and practical implications.

It was made clear that in this procedure the committee is not discarding more inclusive theoretical conceptions such as those of process and system, but is approaching these more inclusive conceptions by giving them content. The committee is not concerned with a census of trade unions or in showing that unions have taken different forms in different places. It is interested in finding ways of analyzing the political process comparatively. It was pointed out that the specific role of unions may to some extent be diagnostic of the condition of the political process in a particular country. Thus the relationship of the union to the political party, to the church, or to ethnic groups may suggest leads regarding the operation of the political process as a whole, its capacity for adjustment to change, its stability, the means employed in attaining change, etc.

OTHER QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

A number of observers have noted that adequate use is not being made of the results of research carried on abroad under the many overseas fellowship programs. During the last decade the number of persons sent abroad to carry on research in the field of comparative political behavior has increased enormously. The Fulbright grants, and fellowships offered by the Board on Overseas Training and Research of the Ford Foundation, by the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, and by the Social Science Research Council provide opportunities for many young scholars to study politics abroad. There is at present no satis-

factory device for giving the best available advice to such individuals before they go abroad, nor for cumulating their findings in a systematic way after they return. Some consideration was given to possible aid of this kind that might be given by the committee. Any effort to bring individuals who expect to do research abroad together before their departure, however, would involve administrative problems of a complicated order, and the committee was not ready to recommend any specific action at this time. It did arrange to obtain information on individuals now studying problems in comparative politics abroad under the various fellowship programs. By examining the different patterns and emphases reflected in their specific field research projects, the committee may be able to propose occasional conferences for scholars whose field research is

related in order to provide for productive exchange of experience and information.

A second immediate consideration has to do with the establishment of contact with European scholars concerned with research on political problems. In view of the opportunity to meet such scholars at the conference on comparative government to be held under the auspices of the International Political Science Association in Florence in April and Roy Macridis' plans to attend the conference, he was asked by the committee to inquire into the research interests of European scholars participating in the conference. He will report to the committee in May on relevant studies of comparative government by Europeans, as well as on possible ways of stimulating research by these scholars and developing cooperative relationships with them.

RENEWAL OF THE COUNCIL'S INTERUNIVERSITY SUMMER RESEARCH SEMINAR PROGRAM

by Paul Webbink

RENEWAL of the Council's interuniversity summer research seminar program, for a three-year period beginning with the summer of 1954, has been made possible by a recent grant to the Council from the Rockefeller Foundation. Two seminars have been definitely scheduled for 1954, and additional suggestions are still being explored, but because of the brief period in which arrangements for the coming summer can be made it is probable that no more than two or three seminars will be held this year. It is hoped that four or five seminars can be organized for each of the summers of 1955 and 1956.

A seminar on research on occupational choice will be held at Columbus during July and August 1954. It is being organized by Herbert S. Parnes of the Department of Economics of Ohio State University. The participants will be drawn from economics, psychology, and sociology. They will attempt to draw together relevant findings from recent research on counseling and guidance, clinical psychology, social stratification, occupational prestige, work attachment, occupational mobility, and other areas, with a view toward preparation of one or more reports designed to aid in planning future research. The second seminar will consist mainly of anthropologists and will deal with certain problems of kinship. It will be held at Cambridge, and is being organized by David M. Schneider of the Department of Social Relations at Harvard University. The partici-

pants will take stock of new research on kinship in relation to recent advances in structural analysis and in psychological and functional analyses. One or more specific research problems in which the implications of these approaches for kinship research can be exploited will be chosen for major attention.

Beginning with the Conference on Learning Theory¹ held at Dartmouth College in the summer of 1950 the Council has sponsored a total of 17 seminars, either under the seminar program operated during 1950-52 or as separate enterprises of the Council in 1953. A few of the seminars evolved from work of research planning committees of the Council but the great majority resulted from the initiative of individuals on various university or college campuses. In order to assure consideration of a wide range of research interests in selecting the program for 1955 it is urged that suggestions for seminars be sent to the Council as early next autumn as possible, even if only in quite preliminary form.

Review of experience with the seminars held in 1950-53 has confirmed the judgment that it would not be desirable to establish precise specifications regarding proposals or the actual conduct of seminars. While the requirements for approval of proposals will therefore

¹ This first seminar was supported from funds provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The interuniversity summer research seminar program as such was supported in 1950-52 by a three-year grant from the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation.

continue to be flexible, several fairly definite considerations have evolved.

NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAM

Except when especially strong reasons to the contrary can be presented, not more than one participant should be drawn from any given institution. The interuniversity character of the seminars is the chief reason for Council sponsorship. Seminar participants have commented that the opportunity to work with others on a common interest not shared with any one at their home institution is in itself one of the most rewarding aspects of the seminar period. The limited funds available for the program make it imperative that these not be used to assist individuals who have adequate opportunities for continuing communication or joint work at their own universities or colleges.

The Council has left to the seminars wide latitude as to purpose: they may engage in actual research, various types of research planning, or individual postgraduate education. Often the seminars have served two or even all three of these purposes. It is still doubtful whether any statement of objectives on the Council's part should go beyond insistence that the seminar involve the advancement of creative research activity and critical thought through the development and application of each member's intellectual resources. In the words used by members of the Dartmouth Conference on Learning Theory in reporting on their summer's experience, the basic objective of the seminars is the restoration for a brief time of the "sort of leisurely, contemplative activity which was once so much more a part of the academic life than it is today."

The objectives of any seminar must be adjusted to the particular intellectual area with which it is concerned. Thus, time spent in assembling a catalog of research proposals for, or in detailed theoretical analysis of, relatively unexplored areas is bound to be frustrating and of limited usefulness both to the participants and to others who might hope to benefit from the seminar's labors. On the other hand, discursive conversation about an area in which considerable specific research is or should be going forward is also wasteful. In drafting a seminar proposal topics meriting a full summer's attention should be carefully distinguished from those suitable for not more than a two- or three-day conference. It appears that the members of seminars have gained most when engaged on specific research projects of their own that were subjected to periodic critical examination by discussion with others working on related projects, or when a substantial but realizable group task was undertaken by the seminar.

NEED FOR CAREFUL PLANNING

The care with which the purpose and procedures of the seminar have been defined in advance, and the extent of prior planning and specific preparation have had a decided bearing on the individual and group productivity of the seminars. In commenting on one of the 1950 seminars T. W. Schultz said: "... painstaking preparations by each participant before meetings of this kind get under way are absolutely essential. The hard thinking that really extends an intellectual frontier is done by an individual working through an idea by himself. When he has done this, he has something to communicate to his colleagues. Not much can be said for the notion that merely bringing a group together and providing opportunity for discussion will yield useful results." Several seminars have found it advantageous to hold preliminary planning sessions several months before the seminar began. Others have achieved a comparably efficient start by requiring that each member bring to the seminar, or circulate in advance, a substantial paper dealing with part of the area to be covered during the summer. Other preparatory devices no doubt merit exploration, but some specific preparation appears essential if a prolonged initial period of desultory discussion is to be avoided.

Agreement in advance upon most of the details of the working schedule is also desirable. In general, the most successful seminars have involved a substantial amount of completely independent work by each participant, apart from the product of the group as a whole. Some seminars have spent a large part of each working day in discussion, but generally it has been found desirable to hold group sessions less frequently. One seminar found it preferable to hold group sessions "only when an individual wanted to deliver new results or to receive advice, criticism, or other kinds of help from the whole group" and when there really was something "to talk about in a meeting."

COMPOSITION

Flexibility concerning the size and composition of seminar groups still appears to be advantageous. Four may be considered the minimum number of participants, and seven is perhaps the maximum. Whether the seminar should consist entirely of members of a single discipline or should be multidisciplinary in composition will depend on the subject matter to be dealt with, the stipulated objective of the seminar, the extent of genuine interest of its members in approaching a common problem, and their readiness to cooperate. A few seminars have expressed the opinion that the oppor-

tunity to develop acquaintance with previously unfamiliar theoretical formulations, types of research, and disciplinary terminology was of great value. More often, however, the individuals who have reported that their investment of time was well rewarded attended seminars that did not have to spend much time in establishing communication between individuals of widely divergent backgrounds. The ease or difficulty with which particular personalities can accommodate themselves to others must be considered in advance in order to assure effective cooperation by the members of a seminar.

While there have been instances of successful leadership by a more mature member of a seminar, on the whole homogeneity of age, rank, and professional prestige seems to be preferable. A few seminars have concluded that participation of one or two graduate students is beneficial to both the students and their seniors, provided that the students are accepted as genuine participants and are not exploited as clerical and bibliographical aides.

DURATION AND STIPENDS

With few exceptions past seminars have been in session for approximately eight weeks. This period, permitting about a month's holiday before resuming academic responsibilities, seems to have been generally acceptable, and it is assumed that considerations of equity will continue to favor proposals covering about this span of time. The stipends provided by the Council are intended to equal approximately the income that participants would otherwise receive from summer-session teaching. Strict application of a "no gain, no loss" policy is, however, likely to result in appreciable variations between individual stipends, and thus far

most seminars have concluded that payment of equal stipends to each member of a given seminar would be better than a graduated scale of payments. The limited funds available and the desirability of giving preference to younger social scientists who have relatively few similar opportunities have tended to result in a stipend of approximately \$1,000 for the summer, supplemented in some cases by moderate travel allowances for those coming from exceptionally distant points.

FACILITIES NEEDED

Twelve campuses have thus far provided facilities for seminars sponsored by the Council, and no doubt others would be equally satisfactory. The adequacy of library resources, offices and meeting rooms, and housing are obviously the determining factors in selecting a site. The location chosen should leave the members of the seminar free of local administrative or other major involvements, though it is advantageous to have some member of a prospective seminar group resident at or near the intended site so that effective responsibility for local arrangements can be exercised.

Every seminar is expected to submit to the Council a more or less formal report, preferably prepared some weeks or months after the seminar ends so that its closing period will not be diverted to a task that can best be undertaken by one of its members. The report is expected to summarize and evaluate the principal facets of the summer's work, indicate plans for individual or group publications, and offer suggestions with respect to the planning and management of future seminars, so that professional colleagues and the Council will be enabled to share the results of each seminar opportunity.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

BUSINESS ENTERPRISE RESEARCH

Howard R. Bowen (chairman), Mary Jean Bowman, J. Keith Butters, Robert Dubin, George Katona, Andreas G. Papandreou, Herbert A. Simon.

The committee was appointed in November 1953 to consider the present state of research on the business enterprise and to develop proposals for the improvement and advancement of research in this area, including various suggestions made at a preliminary conference sponsored by the Council last June. At its first formal meeting, on February 19-20, the committee discussed problems of research planning, communication, and the collection of data as well as over-all considerations of research strategy.

It was concluded that the committee should be concerned first with the completion of a memorandum on "The Business Enterprise as a Subject for Research," which its chairman is preparing with the collaboration of other committee members, and second with the preparation of a volume summarizing and appraising research on a sequence of topics relating to the business enterprise.

CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS RESEARCH

William T. R. Fox (chairman), Gordon A. Craig, John P. Miller, Harold Stein; *staff*, Bryce Wood.

The committee's annotated bibliography on civil-military relations, covering the period 1941-52, will be pub-

lished late in the spring of 1954 by the Columbia University Press. The results of the committee's survey of research in progress on civil-military relations were published in *World Politics*, January 1954, together with a research note by William T. R. Fox. The committee is currently seeking to delimit selected areas for research that would not call for access to classified materials. As a part of this effort, an analysis by Carl Kaysen of certain problems related to the vulnerability of American cities and industries to large-scale aerial attacks was discussed by the committee. This report was also published in the January issue of *World Politics*. It indicates that a sufficient amount of unclassified information is available to permit research on both practical and theoretical problems concerned with the dispersal of industrial installations and with measures for the protection of urban populations, and suggests appropriate techniques of research.

The committee has concluded that important gaps in knowledge exist with respect to the history of American military policy. Viewing military policy as the flow of decisions regarding, for example, the size of the armed forces or methods and circumstances relating to the application of military strength, the committee is seeking to discover ways of stimulating the interest of historians in that neglected area which lies between the traditional fields of military history and diplomatic history. Additional research topics within its field are to be considered at future meetings of the committee.

CROSS-CULTURAL EDUCATION

Ralph L. Beals (chairman), Cora Du Bois, Herbert Hyman, Ronald Lippitt, Charles P. Loomis; *staff*, Joseph B. Casagrande, M. Brewster Smith, Bryce Wood.

At meetings in October and December the committee reviewed the achievements of the projects conducted under its auspices during 1952-53 as the first phase of its program, and laid out the directions for work in the ensuing phase. The first phase had consisted of intensive exploratory studies of the adjustment of foreign students of different nationalities to life on American campuses and their readjustment after return to their home countries, as discussed in the September *Items*. It is expected that the results of these studies will be published in several monographs, each devoted to features of the cross-cultural educational experience encountered by students of a given nationality. As was hoped, these studies had focused the attention of the committee on a number of problems of salient theoretical and practical interest, and resulted in the formulation of many hypotheses about the determinants of various outcomes of the students' sojourn. As is generally the case with intensive studies, however, the data served to document varieties of cross-cultural experience rather than to support firm conclusions about causes and effects. The committee early decided, therefore, that the next phase of its work would be devoted to well-focused, systematic studies designed to test hypotheses and attack major problems discerned in the initial phase of its research.

In October the committee identified a dozen substantive areas on which it thought that systematic work would be valuable. These topics were given preliminary formulation as research problems in a memorandum prepared by the staff for discussion at the December meeting. This memorandum was revised in the light of the committee's discussion and sent to a number of persons and institutions thought to have interest in and facilities for this kind of research, together with an invitation to propose projects to the committee, within the general framework defined by the memorandum, to be undertaken during 1954-55. The projects selected by the committee were to be planned in detail at a workshop in the summer of 1954, to assure their articulation into a coherent program that would also build directly on the previous research under the committee's auspices.

In early February the committee reviewed the proposals received in response to its invitation, and unanimously approved four projects as the core of its program for the following year. Under the direction of Stuart W. Cook, in association with Claire Sellitz, a group at the New York University Research Center for Human Relations will study the effects of different kinds of educational institutions—metropolitan universities, nonmetropolitan universities, and small colleges—on outcomes of foreign study. At the University of Michigan Research Center for Group Dynamics, John R. P. French, Jr., and Robert B. Zajonc will direct a study of factors determining the resolution of conflict between cultural norms among foreign students from a culture sharply contrasting with that of American students. Their research design involves the coordination of survey and experimental methods. At the University of California at Los Angeles, Richard T. Morris, who participated in the study of Scandinavian students under the direction of William H. Sewell in 1952-53, will direct a study of consequences for adjustment to the United States of differing perceptions of national status. At Cornell University, a group under the direction of Robin M. Williams, Jr. will do research on the values of foreign students and of their close associates among American students, as related to patterns of intergroup association and to outcomes with respect to attitudes, opinions, knowledge, and adjustment.

In addition, it is hoped that several persons will be engaged in related studies overseas under Fulbright research grants. Requests for Fulbright research appointments for the evaluation of educational exchange were made by the Fulbright foundations in Austria, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Pakistan. The committee has cooperated with the Committee on International Exchange of Persons of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils in seeking qualified persons interested in undertaking such research in these countries. Once the Fulbright appointments have been made, every effort will be made to establish collaboration with the recipients so that their research can make contributions within the framework of the committee's program.

The persons concerned with the planning of the four projects will meet at the University of Wisconsin for six weeks during the summer in a workshop under the chairmanship of M. Brewster Smith of the committee staff. It is hoped that the persons still to be selected for Fulbright grants will also be able to participate in the workshop. The prospective participants from the four committee projects will meet with the chairman and staff of the committee late in March to develop plans for the workshop. Among its tasks will be (1) joint planning of the several projects for maximum articulation; (2) agreement on certain common data to be collected in all projects and division of labor in the development of common procedures; and (3), as essential to the foregoing tasks, conceptual mapping of the research area, and digesting the implications of research in the first phase of the committee's program and other relevant work. It is expected that the workshop will have the benefit of consultation with participants in the earlier research projects. The committee expects to meet in October 1954 to review its program in the light of the results of the workshop.

The committee has discussed the need for making the implications of its research generally available to administrators and educators concerned with educational exchange, and contemplates preparation of an over-all nontechnical report on its program.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Simon Kuznets (chairman), Shepard B. Clough, Richard Hartshorne, Edgar M. Hoover, Wilbert E. Moore, Morris E. Opler, Joseph J. Spengler.

Two additional studies by European scholars have been arranged by the committee. A study of the historical development of Germany's national income in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, including a re-analysis of both statistical data and the related literature, is being undertaken through collaboration between Paul Jostock, director of the Württemberg statistical office at Stuttgart, Walther G. Hoffmann of the University of Münster, and J. Heinz Müller of the University of Bonn. A critical review of the Italian estimates of national income and wealth since 1860, and the construction of new estimates insofar as possible and necessary, has been begun under the direction of Benedetto Barberi, director of the Central Institute of Statistics in Rome. The committee hopes that the projects which it is initiating will not only provide additional data needed for research on long-term trends in economic growth but will also serve to stimulate continuing collaborative research on economic growth among scholars abroad.

HISTORIOGRAPHY

Thomas C. Cochran (chairman), S. H. Brockunier (secretary), Hugh G. J. Aitken, Shepard B. Clough, Bert J. Loewenberg, Jeannette P. Nichols.

The report of the committee, *The Social Sciences in Historical Study*, will be published early in the summer as

Council Bulletin 64. It is described by the committee as "a product of group thinking," and all of the present members contributed to the final draft of the report. The introductory chapter is by Jeannette P. Nichols. The second chapter is the joint product of Hugh G. J. Aitken and Bert J. Loewenberg. The third and seventh chapters are by Thomas C. Cochran; the fourth and sixth were contributed by S. H. Brockunier, assisted in the final draftsmanship by Mr. Loewenberg; and the fifth is by Shepard B. Clough.

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF PERSONS

(Appointed by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils)

M. H. Trytten (chairman), Marland P. Billings, Francis J. Brown, Harold C. Deutsch, William L. Doyle, James S. Earley, Mortimer Graves, Herbert J. Herring, Sidney Painter, William R. Parker, Paul Weaver, Bryce Wood; staff, Francis A. Young, executive secretary; Truett W. Russell; Elizabeth P. Lam; Gordon Macgregor; Theodore Dombras.

The committee cooperates with the Department of State and the Board of Foreign Scholarships in the administration of the Educational Exchange Program under the Fulbright Act as it applies to university lecturing and advanced research. Opportunities for lecturing and research abroad under the Fulbright Act are publicized by the committee and, with the aid of advisory screening committees, it reviews applications from American scholars and recommends candidates for awards. It also reviews applications from foreign scholars to assure conformity to the provisions of the Fulbright Act and assists foreign scholars to establish institutional affiliations in the United States.

In addition, the committee has recently accepted the responsibility for nominating experienced lecturers for a limited number of teaching opportunities at institutions of higher education in countries not now participating in the program under the Fulbright Act. These opportunities are made possible by the U. S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, Public Law 402, 80th Congress (the Smith-Mundt Act) and through the cooperation of the host countries and institutions. It is expected that the countries will include Brazil, Cuba, Guatemala, Israel, Korea, Mexico, Turkey, and Yugoslavia and that institutions in those countries will request lecturers chiefly in the fields of the humanities and the social sciences for the full academic year and for shorter terms during 1954 and 1955. The committee plans to maintain a register of American professors who are interested in lecturing abroad under the Smith-Mundt program. Inquiries are welcomed and should be addressed to the committee.

Under the Fulbright Act, two major competitions are conducted each year for American lecturers and research scholars: Between March 1 and April 15, applications are accepted for Australia, Burma, Ceylon, India, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, and the Union of South Africa. Between June 1 and October 15, applications are accepted for Austria, Belgium and Luxembourg, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iraq,

Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, and the United Kingdom and Colonial Dependencies.

The 1955-56 announcement for Southeast Asiatic and Pacific countries, just issued, lists many awards in the social sciences. The Philippines offers grants for two social scientists interested in field research; Burma lists three openings for research scholars to be attached to the University of Rangoon. There are lecturing openings in sociology in the Philippines and in India; the latter country proposes a special project in sociology and social welfare. Thailand has also requested a specialist in the field of social welfare. Awards for professors of public administration have been announced for both India and Thailand. Other opportunities are listed for psychologists, economists, and historians. In all, approximately 65 grants are offered at this time for the academic year beginning in the spring or summer of 1955.

Application forms may be obtained from the Executive Secretary, Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, Committee on International Exchange of Persons, Washington 25, D. C.

E.A.H.

LABOR MARKET RESEARCH

Dale Yoder (chairman), E. Wight Bakke, Philip M. Hauser, Clark Kerr, Charles A. Myers, Gladys L. Palmer, Carroll L. Shartle.

A two-day conference on recent research on the internal operations of local unions was held at the University of Chicago under the committee's auspices on February 5-6. The conference, organized by John R. Coleman of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Joel Seidman of the University of Chicago, and William F. Whyte of Cornell University, discussed the principal approaches and techniques used in these studies and attempted to clarify several general conceptual problems. An account of the points on which general conclusions or divergent points of view were formulated will be prepared by Mr. Coleman and his colleagues for publication in a suitable journal. Apart from the program subcommittee those participating were: Fred H. Blum, Robert L. Kahn, and Leonard R. Sayles of the University of Michigan; John P. Caldwell and Frederick H. Harbison of the University of Chicago; Milton Derber, Ruth A. Hudson, and Hjalmar Rosen of the University of Illinois; John T. Gullahorn of Ohio University; Thomas Mahoney, Arnold M. Rose, Walter Uphoff, and Dale Yoder of the University of Minnesota; Glenn W. Miller of Ohio State University; Charles A. Myers of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Theodore V. Purcell of Loyola University; George Strauss of Cornell University; Philip Taft of Brown University; and Paul Webbink of the Council staff.

Labor Mobility in Six Cities, prepared by Gladys L. Palmer with the assistance of Carol P. Brainerd as the final report on the committee's extensive survey of labor mobility, will be published by the Council in June; and *Labor Mobility and Economic Opportunity*, a volume of papers

by several members of the committee summarizing the results of research on which they and their colleagues have been engaged, is to be published by the Technology Press and John Wiley and Sons in August. A third volume on labor mobility, Herbert S. Parnes' "Research in Labor Mobility: An Appraisal of Research Findings in the United States," will also be issued in the summer, as Council Bulletin 65.

LINGUISTICS AND PSYCHOLOGY

Floyd G. Lounsbury (chairman), John B. Carroll, Joseph Greenberg, James J. Jenkins, Charles E. Osgood, Thomas A. Sebeok; staff, Joseph B. Casagrande.

A meeting of the committee on February 12-13 was devoted primarily to critical review of a report on the field of psycholinguistics, based on the work of the seminar on this topic held under the committee's auspices last summer at Indiana University. The report, edited by Charles E. Osgood and Thomas A. Sebeok, is essentially the collaborative product of the entire group of seminar participants. Included in this group in addition to committee members (most of whom participated in the seminar discussions for the full eight weeks it was in session) were the following advanced graduate students: Susan M. Ervin, social psychology, University of Michigan; Leonard D. Newmark, linguistics, Indiana University; Sol Saporta, Spanish linguistics, University of Illinois; Donald E. Walker, psychology, University of Chicago; and Kellogg Wilson, psychology, University of Illinois.

The report presents a preliminary topographical analysis of the field of psycholinguistics and discusses a wide range of research problems, drawing on the joint resources of method and theory derived from general linguistics, information theory, and learning theory as well as other psychological approaches. Sections on linguistics, information theory, and learning theory, each written as a general introduction for nonspecialists in the other two fields, are also included. The manuscript is currently being revised with a view to early publication. It is hoped that the report will be of interest to many linguists and psychologists as well as to persons in other disciplines who are concerned with research on problems of language behavior. A selected bibliography of research on psycholinguistic problems is being compiled and annotated under the direction of John B. Carroll. It is thought that such a bibliography will provide a useful supplement to the seminar report.

A work conference on research problems in bilingualism, bringing together a small group of linguists, psychologists, and anthropologists, will be held in New York City, probably at Columbia University, on May 10-11. The conference, the first in a projected series on key problems in the field of language behavior, is being organized by Uriel Weinrich, Assistant Professor in the Department of General and Comparative Linguistics at Columbia University, who will also act as chairman. A second conference on methodological problems of content analysis is tentatively planned for the autumn of 1954.

MATHEMATICAL TRAINING OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

William G. Madow (chairman), E. P. Hutchinson, Jacob Marschak, George A. Miller, Frederick Mosteller, Robert M. Thrall; *staff*, Elbridge Sibley.

Tentative plans for two summer institutes in mathematics to be held in 1955, one at a university on the Pacific Coast and the other in the middle west, were formulated by a subcommittee at a meeting on February 25, subject to review by the full committee at a later meeting. According to the tentative plans, two separate programs will be offered at each of the institutes, for those who do and those who do not have previous training in calculus, respectively. The committee agreed last fall that no institute would be held in the summer of 1954, in order that its experience with the institute held at Dartmouth College in 1953 might first be effectively reviewed and that teaching materials might be further developed.

MEASUREMENT OF OPINION, ATTITUDES AND CONSUMER WANTS (Joint with the National Research Council)

Samuel A. Stouffer (chairman), S. S. Wilks (vice-chairman), Edward Battey, Hadley Cantril, Archibald M. Crossley, W. Edwards Deming, Robert F. Elder, George Gallup, Philip M. Hauser, Carl I. Hovland, George F. Hussey, Jr., Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Rensis Likert, Darrell B. Lucas, Elmo Roper, Walter A. Shewhart.

Scheduled for fall publication by the University of Chicago Press is the final over-all report on the studies of isolation, measurement, and control of interviewer effect, which were carried on by the National Opinion Research Center, with the sponsorship of the joint committee. The authors of this volume are Herbert Hyman, William Cobb, Jacob Feldman, Clyde W. Hart, and Herbert Stember.

POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

David B. Truman (chairman), Conrad M. Arensberg, Angus Campbell, Alfred de Grazia, Oliver Garceau, V. O. Key, Avery Leiserson, M. Brewster Smith.

At its December meeting the committee discussed with Lucian W. Pye of Princeton University a memorandum on problems in the study of comparative politics in non-Western areas, which he was preparing for the Princeton conference, described on pages 1-2 *supra*. Comparative politics had been one of several focal areas on which the committee had decided in the spring of 1953 to concentrate its attention in 1953-54. With the appointment of the new Committee on Comparative Politics as an outcome of the Princeton conference, the committee turned in January to another of these areas, namely, state and local government. Its discussion centered on a memorandum by Oliver Garceau, two research reports that he had prepared in association with Corinne Silverman, and on a proposal by Avery Leiserson for cooperative research on the legislative process.

The volume by Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin, and Warren Miller reporting on the study of the 1952 presidential election by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center under the auspices of the committee went to press in December 1953. Early publication by Row, Peterson and Company is expected.

PREVENTIVE MEDICINE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Hugh R. Leavell (chairman), Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Robert B. Hall, H. van Zile Hyde, Benjamin D. Paul, Lyle Saunders, Leo W. Simmons.

The committee was appointed in November 1953 to explore ways of developing research on social aspects of preventive medicine, in accordance with recommendations of a conference, sponsored by the Council earlier in the year, on public health and area research programs. The conference discussed the development of relationships between specialists in the field of public health and social scientists, with particular reference to training for work in these fields now offered by university curricula and to private and public programs of technical assistance in foreign countries. The new committee at its first meeting on January 7 agreed upon the desirability of an initial review of the full range of relationships between social scientists and specialists in the areas of preventive medicine and public health. Discussion by the committee indicated a convergence of interests at several points, notably the evaluation of public health programs, and experimentation in the application of methods of social science research. It was recognized that public health activities are carried on in social contexts and that social scientists and public health specialists may be mutually interested in defining the elements of such contexts in order to draw attention to their significance for specific cases. It was thought that there is growing recognition of the validity of the view that the practical effectiveness of public health programs depends on both their medical efficiency and their cultural acceptability. In order to clarify some of the relationships that might be developed, the members of the committee agreed to prepare statements of their views concerning areas of impingement between the several fields involved. These statements will be discussed at a meeting of the committee in April.

SCALING THEORY AND METHODS

Harold Gulliksen (chairman), Paul Horst, John E. Karlin, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Henry Margenau, Frederick Mosteller, John Volkmann; *staff*, Warren S. Torgerson.

Work on the monograph on scaling theory and methods initiated under the committee's direction in the summer of 1951 was interrupted in the autumn of 1952 by the recall of Warren S. Torgerson to service in the U. S. Navy. Mr. Torgerson was released from the Navy on March 15 and plans to resume preparation of his manuscript in April.

SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (chairman), Leon Festinger, Irving L. Janis, Donald G. Marquis, Horace M. Miner, Robert R. Sears, William H. Sewell, Robin M. Williams, Jr.; staff, M. Brewster Smith.

The first meeting of the committee since early 1953 was held in December. Progress on work under the auspices of the Subcommittee on Child Development as reported in the December *Items* was reviewed, and the committee's functions were reappraised in the light of the state of its program. One phase of the committee's work is drawing to completion now that the pilot cross-cultural research on child rearing is being launched by the subcommittee; no tangible steps have been found for advancing cross-cultural

studies of the other focal problems that the committee had previously explored. In the view of the committee it could further the development of research on social behavior most effectively by broadening its scope beyond the cross-cultural approach. Discussion centered particularly on problems of research training and ways of facilitating the coordination of complementary experimental and field techniques. Several specific research areas were discussed in relation to possible committee activities.

Albert J. Reiss, Jr. of Vanderbilt University completed late in 1953 an initial draft of his memorandum for the committee on research in community contexts. A revised draft of this memorandum will be circulated for critical comment during the spring.

PERSONNEL

DIRECTORS OF THE COUNCIL

The seven national social science organizations associated with the Council have designated the following persons to serve as directors of the Council for the three-year term 1954-56:

- Gordon R. Willey, Harvard University, by the American Anthropological Association
- D. Gale Johnson, University of Chicago, by the American Economic Association
- Roy F. Nichols, University of Pennsylvania, by the American Historical Association
- V. O. Key, Harvard University, by the American Political Science Association
- Carroll L. Shartle, Ohio State University, by the American Psychological Association
- Robert E. L. Faris, University of Washington, by the American Sociological Society
- S. S. Wilks, Princeton University, by the American Statistical Association.

Their credentials are scheduled for acceptance by the board of directors of the Council at its spring meeting in New York on March 27-28, 1954.

FIRST-YEAR GRADUATE STUDY FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Undergraduate Research Training—Douglas McGregor (chairman), R. F. Arragon, E. Adamson Hoebel, Robert B. MacLeod, Albert J. Reiss, Jr., and George E. Simpson—has awarded first-year graduate study fellowships for 1954-55 to 16 of the 41 college seniors who received undergraduate research stipends in 1953. The recipients of these stipends performed original research in the social sciences under faculty guidance during the summer between their junior and senior years, and have continued work on their projects during the senior year. The fellowships for first-year graduate study have been awarded to those students who showed greatest promise of achieve-

ment in social science research. Each fellow will receive a stipend for maintenance, and the Council will pay his tuition at the graduate school of his choice. Appointees will be under no formal commitment to continue beyond the first year of graduate study in social science, but it is hoped that most of them will do so and that they will make their careers in this field.

The students selected by the committee, their undergraduate colleges, major fields of study, and the titles of their undergraduate research projects are listed below (graduate schools are not listed as not all students have yet made definite choices):

- Peter B. Bart, Swarthmore College; political science; voting behavior and political attitudes in Philadelphia.
- Janice G. Bernstein, Sarah Lawrence College; psychology; theories of "the healthy personality," surveyed and analyzed from the literature.
- Jeanne D. Erard, Radcliffe College; psychology; relation between cognitive organization and the expression of emotional states.
- David B. Eyde, University of Hawaii; anthropology; adjustment of Samoan immigrants in Hawaii.
- Mary L. Eysenbach, Reed College; economics; pricing and production in the Oregon milk market.
- Raoul J. Freeman, Brooklyn College; economics; behavior and motivation in investment.
- Jay C. Greenfield, Cornell University; sociology; types of political apathy among college students, and some of its sociological and psychological correlates.
- Carol Klapprodt, Wayne University; sociology; analysis of fertility in Detroit.
- Richard D. Mann, Jr., Harvard University; social psychology; role differentiation in small groups.
- Frederic A. Mosher, Oberlin College; psychology; some effects of the Tennessee Valley Authority on cities in the area.

Esther Newcomb, Antioch College; social psychology; group tensions in an academic organization.

Donald L. Noel, University of Wisconsin; sociology; roles of Negro students at segregated and nonsegregated colleges.

Norma Schilling, Washington University; sociology and political science; middle-class voting behavior in St. Louis.

Barbara J. Staner, University of Wichita; psychology; social influences on the perception of an ambiguous stimulus.

J. Robert Wallace, Reed College; anthropology; personality development of Sahaptin Indian children on the Warm Springs Reservation.

Calvert W. Watkins, Harvard University; linguistics; language and culture in Ancient Gaul.

CONFERENCE BOARD OF ASSOCIATED RESEARCH COUNCILS

The Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, consisting of representatives of the American Council on Education, the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Research Council, and the Social Science Research Council, has chosen Pendleton Herring as its chairman for the current year, succeeding Ross G. Harrison who had been the Conference Board's chairman since its organization in 1944. As its vice-chairman for 1954 the Board elected Mortimer Graves, executive director of the American Council of Learned Societies, and as secretary S. Douglas Cornell, executive officer of the National Research Council.

PUBLICATIONS

COUNCIL BULLETINS AND MONOGRAPHS

Adjustment to Physical Handicap and Illness: A Survey of the Social Psychology of Physique and Disability, Bulletin 55, revised edition, by Roger G. Barker, in collaboration with Beatrice A. Wright, Lee Meyerson, Mollie R. Gonick. April 1953. 456 pp. \$2.00.

Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research, edited by Edmund H. Volkart. June 1951. 348 pp. Cloth, \$3.00.

Support for Independent Scholarship and Research by Elbridge Sibley. Report of an inquiry jointly sponsored by the American Philosophical Society and the Social Science Research Council. May 1951. 131 pp. \$1.25.

Area Research: Theory and Practice, Bulletin 63, by Julian H. Steward. August 1950. 183 pp. \$1.50.

Culture Conflict and Crime, Bulletin 41, by Thorsten Sellin. 1938; reprinted September 1950. 116 pp. \$1.00.

Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research, Bulletin 62, by Otto Klineberg. May 1950. 238 pp. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

Labor-Management Relations: A Research Planning Memorandum, Bulletin 61, by John G. Turnbull. October 1949. 121 pp. \$1.25.

The Pre-election Polls of 1948: Report to the Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts, Bulletin 60, by Frederick Mosteller, Herbert Hyman, Philip J. McCarthy, Eli S. Marks, David B. Truman, with the collaboration of L. W. Doob, Duncan MacRae, Jr., F. F. Stephan, S. A. Stouffer, S. S. Wilks. September 1949. 416 pp. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

PAMPHLETS

Bibliographies on Personality and Social Development of the Child, Pamphlet 10, compiled by Christoph Heinicke and Beatrice B. Whiting. June 1953. 138 pp. \$1.00.

Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education, Pamphlet 9, by Guy S. Métraux. June 1952. 58 pp. 50 cents.

Area Studies in American Universities by Wendell C. Bennett. 1951. 92 pp. \$1.00.

Domestic Control of Atomic Energy, Pamphlet 8, by Robert A. Dahl and Ralph S. Brown, Jr. 1951. 122 pp. \$1.00.

All publications listed are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors, 1954: RAY A. BILLINGTON, TAYLOR COLE, GORDON A. CRAIG, FRED EGGAN, ROBERT E. L. FARIS, LUTHER GULICK, ROBERT B. HALL, PENDLETON HERRING, ERNEST R. HILGARD, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, D. GALE JOHNSON, V. O. KEY, ALEXANDER H. LEIGHTON, DONALD G. MARQUIS, DOUGLAS MCGREGOR, JOHN P. MILLER, PHILIP E. MOSELY, FREDERICK MOSTELLER, ROY F. NICHOLS, CARROLL L. SHARTLE, MORTIMER SPIEGELMAN, GEORGE W. STOCKING, CONRAD TAEUBER, DOROTHY S. THOMAS, SCHUYLER C. WALLACE, HERBERT WECHSLER, S. S. WILKS, GORDON R. WILLEY, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, DONALD YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; M. BREWSTER SMITH; ROBERT N. WILSON; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Financial Secretary*